



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,236	04/12/2007	Akihito Shimahara	278542005800	5420

25225 7590 10/14/2011
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 HIGH BLUFF DRIVE
SUITE 100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2040

EXAMINER

SIVJI, NIZAR N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

10/14/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

EOfficeSD@mofo.com
PatentDocket@mofo.com
Drcaldwell@mofo.com

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/588,236	Applicant(s) SHIMAHARA ET AL.	
	Examiner NIZAR SIVJI	Art Unit 2617	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NIZAR SIVJI. (3) ____.

(2) Michael Stanley (Reg. No. 58, 523). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 30 September 2011.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
 ☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Issues Discussed ☐101 ☐112 ☐102 ☐103 ☒Others
 (For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Substance of Interview
 (For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

Attorney described Applicant Invention regarding "Mobile Telephone Unit with Broadcast Receiving Function" and explained the limitation based on argument filed on 7/28/2011 and explained how claimed limitation "a judgement unit operable to judge whether the acquired position information of the base station is stored in the storage unit" and further suggested to clarify the limitation so as to further explain the claimed language. Examiner also proposed dependent claims 4, 5 or 6 to be in-cooperated with the independent claim to expedite prosecution. However, no agreement was made. Thus, a new ground rejection is issued and further search/consideration might be required upon Applicant's response.

Applicant recordation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recordation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

/NIZAR SIVJI/ Examiner, Art Unit 2617	
------------------------------------------	--